

The University of Maine

DigitalCommons@UMaine

---

General University of Maine Publications

University of Maine Publications

---

2-3-2014

## Faculty Forum : Signature and Emerging Programs - Update on Progress

University of Maine Office of Academic Affairs

Follow this and additional works at: [https://digitalcommons.library.umaine.edu/univ\\_publications](https://digitalcommons.library.umaine.edu/univ_publications)



Part of the [Higher Education Commons](#), and the [History Commons](#)

---

### Repository Citation

University of Maine Office of Academic Affairs, "Faculty Forum : Signature and Emerging Programs - Update on Progress" (2014). *General University of Maine Publications*. 977.

[https://digitalcommons.library.umaine.edu/univ\\_publications/977](https://digitalcommons.library.umaine.edu/univ_publications/977)

This Video Recording is brought to you for free and open access by DigitalCommons@UMaine. It has been accepted for inclusion in General University of Maine Publications by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@UMaine. For more information, please contact [um.library.technical.services@maine.edu](mailto:um.library.technical.services@maine.edu).

February 19, 2014 University of Maine Faculty Forum: Signature and Emerging Programs - Update on Progress

University of Maine Provost Jeffrey E. Hecker

TRANSCRIPT

00:00  
thank you for coming so as I was saying  
00:03  
what I want to do today is give you a  
00:05  
quick overview of what we're trying to  
00:08  
accomplish here I do want to take a  
00:11  
moment to sort of walk through the  
00:12  
background and so how do we got to where  
00:13  
we are today and then the plan going  
00:17  
forward so as I was starting to say they  
00:22  
saw this idea of identifying signature  
00:25  
areas in emerging areas at the  
00:27  
University of Maine came out of the blue  
00:30  
sky strategic plan if you go back and  
00:33  
review plan you'll see that primarily  
00:36  
was published identifying what are our  
00:39  
signature areas of research in one of  
00:42  
the areas of emerging excellence in  
00:44  
research and the thinking was that or  
00:47  
the language was that we would do that  
00:50  
we would review our areas so that we can  
00:52  
give priority for funding so that we're  
00:55  
preserving the things that we're known  
00:57  
for the things that are as soon as there  
00:59  
is and then we can also invest wisely in

01:03  
areas that are emerging and have the  
01:05  
potential to reach the national  
01:08  
international significance for the  
01:10  
University of Maine so that's where this  
01:14  
endeavor began last year there was a lot  
01:19  
of conversation in around the campus  
01:21  
about this the Faculty Senate took some  
01:26  
time and that I think particularly the  
01:28  
executive committee of the Faculty  
01:30  
Senate and I think what they did by the  
01:34  
way Harlan explained it to me was they  
01:36  
looked at the blue sky plan and the the  
01:40  
Senate executives sent forward a series  
01:42  
of memos to each of the pathways with  
01:46  
suggestions about various aspects of  
01:49  
what each pathway was responsible for so  
01:52  
they sent a memo on January twenty third  
01:55  
last year with some suggestions to aid  
01:59  
and move forward things forward in  
02:00  
pathway one and I mentioned that because  
02:02  
a while actually that memo included a  
02:07  
pretty detailed explanation of how are  
02:09  
they wreck  
02:10  
anyway this perceived I mentioned that  
02:14  
because I think it's an important part  
02:16  
of the conversation is that that memo  
02:18

and discussions that followed about it  
02:20  
and from it have influenced the way this  
02:21  
process has unfolding I'll highlight  
02:24  
ways in a minute the other next sort of  
02:29  
step I guess was pathway one subgroup of  
02:33  
pathway once spent some time focusing on  
02:36  
this signature in emerging and  
02:38  
interpreting it and coming up with some  
02:39  
guides of how we might implement this  
02:44  
action of identifying signature in  
02:46  
emerging areas and I lifted just some of  
02:48  
the language of what came out of boldly  
02:51  
Marquez draft but a draft recommendation  
02:54  
from pathway one about how to proceed  
02:56  
and again what I've what I've chosen to  
02:59  
highlight is that you can see what they  
03:01  
were what the focus of that set of  
03:03  
recommendations were one things that are  
03:05  
new the things that are not so much  
03:07  
where we're established but things that  
03:09  
are new and emerging and it were very  
03:14  
explicit in that language to talk about  
03:16  
new money that what were there looking  
03:18  
for izzy's got this was a set of  
03:20  
guidelines and recommendations for new  
03:22  
money coming into the University of how  
03:24  
new money might be used and they even

03:26  
talked about what what they meant by new  
03:28  
money so for an example they gave for  
03:30  
example an increase in MAF funding being  
03:32  
example of new money that came in how it  
03:35  
should be dispersed and they even  
03:36  
included some language about not  
03:39  
cannibalizing I think was the word they  
03:41  
used other programs so this year well  
03:49  
okay so this year you got a new provost  
03:53  
and a lot of things get put on my desk  
03:56  
and one is guess what you're responsible  
03:58  
for this so let's think about how we  
04:00  
want to implement it so I do what I do  
04:02  
is gather the information that had been  
04:04  
produced so far and start to have  
04:08  
discussions with people and think about  
04:10  
how we want to go about do this one  
04:14  
thing that came through very clearly  
04:15  
from the recommendations that came out  
04:17  
of the Faculty Senate and pathway one  
04:19  
was that they wanted some kind of  
04:21  
process that was open the head come  
04:23  
kind of opportunity for people to  
04:25  
express their ideas or their make their  
04:30  
plea or make make their case why their  
04:33  
area might be considered signature at  
04:36

the University another thing that  
04:38  
emerged from the discussions again the  
04:41  
Faculty Senate memo and discussions that  
04:45  
came out of this was that people start  
04:47  
talking beyond beyond just research  
04:50  
areas to look at other aspects of the  
04:53  
university and looking at how we would  
04:56  
evaluate them what we could consider  
04:57  
signature that wasn't solely focused on  
05:01  
on research but also in our educational  
05:06  
mission there was also again I credit  
05:09  
the Faculty Senate for highlighting this  
05:11  
that we need to be mindful that the  
05:13  
university can't advance if we only  
05:17  
focus on those things are that are  
05:19  
established as excellent and those  
05:21  
things that are new and exciting but  
05:25  
there are certain things that are  
05:26  
foundational to any university  
05:27  
particularly if we're talking about the  
05:28  
educational area that that are  
05:32  
foundational for any of you know any  
05:34  
quality education and if we're going to  
05:37  
continue to do that provide our students  
05:39  
with a well-rounded quality education we  
05:40  
can't ignore these foundational areas  
05:42  
and so there was a call for attention to

05:46  
that and again I thought that was  
05:47  
important the other piece I guess I'd  
05:51  
put it as a bullet point but the other  
05:52  
thing of course is that looking at what  
05:54  
came out of pathway one looking at the  
05:58  
universities of situation with respect  
06:02  
to our budget it's it's clear that  
06:07  
significant amounts of new money are not  
06:09  
going to be coming down raining on the  
06:11  
university and in fact we're making very  
06:14  
difficult decisions about how to use the  
06:17  
resources that we currently have and so  
06:22  
thinking about how this exercise of  
06:25  
identifying areas that are signature and  
06:26  
emerging can benefit the university is  
06:29  
to think about can we engage in a  
06:32  
process as a campus to identify these  
06:36  
areas and that  
06:36  
the end product would be we've  
06:40  
identified area X to be a signature area  
06:43  
and what that and that that would be one  
06:46  
of the factors we consider as we move  
06:48  
forward making the decisions that we  
06:50  
make every year such as how to handle a  
06:53  
budget cut how what faculty lines to  
06:56  
approve what do we highlight in our  
06:59

fundraising effort and how do we  
07:01  
allocate our limited resources for  
07:04  
private fundraising how do we how do we  
07:10  
advance in our in our in our efforts to  
07:14  
recruit students we're making these kind  
07:18  
of decisions all the time and they're  
07:21  
made for a whole variety of reasons and  
07:24  
I don't see Harlan here but I don't know  
07:27  
i'm thinking mind if i quote him at  
07:29  
Harlan says that sometimes  
07:31  
administrators make these of arbitrary  
07:35  
and capricious decisions so this is an  
07:38  
effort to be somewhat less arbitrary and  
07:40  
capricious and more open to say as a  
07:43  
campus we've decided that this is an  
07:45  
important area and so as we're making  
07:47  
decisions we're going to we're going to  
07:50  
consider that consider that we feel that  
07:52  
this is a signature and to use that as  
07:54  
an example of signature area for the  
07:56  
university we want to make sure that  
07:58  
it's adequately supported so with that  
08:02  
in mind with those sort of ideas in mind  
08:05  
we set out in a process of inviting and  
08:09  
figuring out how to have an open open  
08:13  
process here in public discourse about  
08:15  
this so many of you were there on



08:17  
December third we had an open forum  
08:20  
there about 55 faculty who attended I  
08:23  
went through some of this background  
08:25  
information we summarized what was our  
08:30  
Harlan actually got up and summarized  
08:31  
some of the points from the faculty  
08:33  
Senate's memo and we had I thought a  
08:37  
good interchange there was a lot of good  
08:40  
questions a lot of challenging questions  
08:43  
there was good discussion about what  
08:45  
this could mean what this might look  
08:48  
like for the University of Maine  
08:50  
so from there we took that and again to  
08:54  
try to keep the conversation going we  
08:57  
created a website on the website we  
08:59  
posted the slides that we use we posted  
09:02  
Robin wrote a summary of the notes of  
09:04  
the discussion and we put a film up if  
09:08  
you're again bored there's a YouTube of  
09:12  
the entire conversation so that people  
09:15  
can see and then we created a way for  
09:17  
people to give further input right so  
09:19  
you could you could write in further  
09:21  
comments so again this is all in an  
09:24  
effort to have this be an open  
09:26  
discussion amongst our faculty and  
09:30

administrators about how to move this  
09:32  
this this initiative forward be honest  
09:37  
we weren't overwhelmed with written in  
09:39  
put into our website but we got about  
09:41  
three or four people who wrote in and  
09:44  
another three or four people who didn't  
09:46  
follow directions but wrote to me  
09:47  
directly in an email and that was fine  
09:49  
so we got some input that way so the  
09:54  
next step was to try to advance this was  
09:58  
working with an advisory group so I  
10:00  
formed an advisory group of  
10:03  
administrators and faculty to take what  
10:07  
the assignment was to say I said to them  
10:09  
was look here's all this background  
10:11  
material here's what came out of the  
10:12  
Faculty Senate here's what came out of  
10:13  
pathway one hears Robins written summary  
10:17  
of the discussion here's the the video  
10:20  
if you want to watch it I'm sure how  
10:23  
many actually did but I encourage them  
10:24  
to and then I said well what what the  
10:28  
the task for this group is is to help me  
10:31  
figure out a couple of things one is  
10:33  
what are the criteria we're going to use  
10:36  
to evaluate proposals we already decided  
10:39  
because there was again that seemed to

10:41  
be the consensus that the campus was  
10:43  
interested in an open process that we  
10:45  
would solicit proposals about you know  
10:48  
what should be considered a signature in  
10:50  
nor merging area and so if we're going  
10:53  
to get those proposals what would be the  
10:54  
criteria against which we evaluated the  
10:56  
proposals in a second task for the group  
10:59  
was I said help me think through a  
11:02  
process  
11:03  
you know that is you know reasonable  
11:06  
within time frame that would make this  
11:09  
useful and that that you know invites  
11:15  
the advice a reasonable amount of  
11:17  
interaction but designee Lee isn't  
11:19  
overly burdensome I said it the last in  
11:21  
December when we met one of the things I  
11:23  
didn't want to do was to send that the  
11:25  
scent factly off to write lengthy  
11:28  
proposals occupying their time in ways  
11:33  
that would not be constructive so we  
11:35  
thought about what could be an iterative  
11:37  
process and actually so anyway that all  
11:40  
happened on January 10 I took that  
11:42  
advisory group that you saw we went away  
11:44  
for a day or the better part of the day  
11:47

we had actually two facilitators folks  
11:51  
from Cooperative Extension who helped to  
11:53  
keep us organized and the discussion  
11:55  
flowing we made the decision that it  
11:59  
would be very difficult to come over the  
12:01  
criteria that would be applicable both  
12:04  
to research areas in areas of Education  
12:07  
so we decided to separate that out and  
12:11  
have two groups off thinking about these  
12:14  
different ways and exchanging  
12:15  
information blah blah if you notice in  
12:19  
the sorry i meant dimensions if you  
12:21  
notice in the advisory group it included  
12:23  
faculty administration it also included  
12:25  
one member of the public miles thiemann  
12:27  
was on the board of visitors and a good  
12:30  
friend of the university and actually  
12:32  
mentioned because he brought a ray I  
12:33  
think useful perspective to the  
12:35  
discussion so coming out of that meeting  
12:40  
we drafted criteria I send it back to  
12:43  
the group feedback some back and forth  
12:45  
electronically I shared it with the  
12:49  
president got some feedback there I sent  
12:53  
it to the Faculty Senate leadership for  
12:56  
their comment like received none but I  
13:01  
did i do want you to know i sent it to

13:02  
them so let me jump to the timeline of  
13:07  
what we're looking at so we what we did  
13:11  
actually on that Monday february third I  
13:15  
sent out the RFP  
13:17  
actually the Friday before that I sent a  
13:19  
memo to every faculty member describing  
13:22  
this process and what we wanted to try  
13:24  
to accomplish on february third we sent  
13:28  
out the the RFP that I assume that I  
13:31  
assume you saw we are meeting today  
13:35  
again the purpose of today's meeting is  
13:37  
to have you know an open discussion  
13:39  
where people can ask questions about you  
13:42  
know I anticipate should be about the  
13:44  
process but of course you can ask  
13:45  
questions or anything you want but you  
13:48  
might ask questions about the intent of  
13:49  
this program as well and I'm happy to  
13:50  
try to clarify that as best as best I  
13:53  
can we pushed back because of the snow  
13:56  
day last week and we cancelled this form  
13:58  
the first time we push back the deadline  
14:01  
a little bit for concept papers did back  
14:04  
to february 28th and the review team and  
14:07  
I'll show you the members of the review  
14:08  
team in a second we're nice enough to  
14:10

say that's all right we'll we will do it  
14:12  
in the time you give us if we can get  
14:14  
them roughly around the 28th what I've  
14:18  
got planned then is that we will receive  
14:20  
these three page concept papers the  
14:23  
review team will meet on March  
14:24  
seventeenth we'll set aside a block of  
14:27  
time you've seen the criteria there is a  
14:31  
rating that goes along with that we're  
14:34  
not looking at doing any kind of a  
14:36  
anticipate is doing a but may do some  
14:39  
numerical just to get a broad summary  
14:41  
but what we wanted to have a discussion  
14:43  
about these proposals because two things  
14:46  
i anticipate would come out of that  
14:48  
discussion about based on the concept  
14:51  
papers one is that we would be able to  
14:53  
well maybe three things okay what is  
14:55  
that we would communicate back to some  
14:58  
groups saying hey we think you're right  
14:59  
on track we encourage you and would like  
15:01  
you to submit a full proposal the other  
15:03  
might be to send to folks saying really  
15:05  
don't think this is broad enough or  
15:07  
matches the criteria that we've  
15:09  
established you haven't made a  
15:12  
convincing case and we love you anyway

15:14  
but but don't bother to do a final  
15:16  
proposal and the third thing that might  
15:18  
come out of this is that we would say to  
15:21  
one group hey you know what you  
15:22  
presented something that's awfully  
15:23  
similar to this group over here and  
15:25  
we're encouraging you all to get  
15:26  
together and talk about this and here's  
15:28  
some guidelines of how you might  
15:30  
think about putting together and  
15:31  
submitting a different proposal or  
15:33  
integrated proposal so we're going to  
15:36  
have time to discuss these concept  
15:39  
papers and hopefully look for for that  
15:41  
kind of integration I said I would  
15:44  
mention the review team so the review  
15:46  
team you'll look it looks a lot like the  
15:48  
advisory team but there it is different  
15:50  
so Janet Waldron was on the advisory  
15:53  
group she's not on here Jeff st. John  
15:55  
was on the advisory group he's not going  
15:56  
to be on the review team there were some  
16:00  
faculty changes alia betty was added  
16:02  
from engineering think where else that  
16:07  
might have been the only one that we  
16:10  
added and then miles agreed to continue  
16:13

now I have external reviewer one  
16:15  
external reviewer to in what I send out  
16:17  
to you all a few weeks ago I just had  
16:19  
one external reviewer and I I thought I  
16:21  
had the perfect person and I still think  
16:24  
I had the perfect person identified  
16:25  
except for the fact that they wouldn't  
16:26  
do it so I had talked with a person who  
16:30  
I thought really could bring what my  
16:33  
thinking was I'd say my but this was  
16:36  
discussed with the advisory group is  
16:38  
that if we could bring someone who had  
16:40  
not a main centric view but a more  
16:42  
national view about higher education and  
16:45  
directions in higher education that  
16:51  
could think of then that would be a  
16:53  
different perspective to bring into our  
16:54  
discussion about about this since we  
16:57  
didn't succeed with the first person  
16:59  
we've got a couple of invitations out  
17:01  
right now one is actually they're both  
17:05  
people from the from AAAS but it's two  
17:08  
different aaass american academy of arts  
17:10  
and sciences there's someone i know  
17:14  
there and i haven't heard from them yet  
17:16  
so dance and wise actually said you know  
17:18  
someone else that I can contact okay



17:21  
we're going to look for someone there  
17:22  
and the other AAAS which is about  
17:25  
advanced from the science something you  
17:27  
probably all know the the acronym and  
17:29  
I'm blocking on it but I have an  
17:31  
invitation from someone there the two  
17:33  
people that have invited their academic  
17:35  
backgrounds one's the physicists and  
17:36  
one's a historian but they also  
17:38  
represent again they they're they're  
17:41  
involved with national organization  
17:43  
looking at higher education and research  
17:47  
so I'm hoping that we can succeed in  
17:50  
getting at least one of hopefully a  
17:52  
couple of voices that are not a main  
17:56  
focus but can help bring a different  
17:57  
perspective to our evaluation of these  
17:59  
proposals okay so that's where we stand  
18:04  
right now could show you the criteria  
18:08  
because you know you've already seen  
18:09  
them so let me just open up and and see  
18:13  
if there are questions obviously what  
18:17  
question is an army group four different  
18:20  
numbers tossed around of them I guess  
18:24  
now poor areas signature emerging  
18:27  
research and teaching on how many awards  
18:31

are you talking total column that we use  
18:34  
the word awards because no one's getting  
18:35  
it out of the words sorry already  
18:37  
anything in this designation and then  
18:41  
the second thing going to do is not  
18:42  
answer your question directly because I  
18:44  
and that's on purpose right I I would  
18:48  
like to see what emerges it's out I'll  
18:51  
answer it i'll not answered them sort of  
18:53  
suggestion I'd like we'd like to see  
18:54  
what emerges right I don't want to  
18:56  
apparently said we have to have three in  
18:58  
each of four in each or widening but so  
19:02  
I saw we haven't on purpose we have not  
19:04  
a dozen another variation of that  
19:07  
question is what's the minimum of what's  
19:08  
the maximum understand it either my own  
19:11  
impression might be that three or four  
19:13  
in each area would be  
19:14  
reasonable number maybe as many as as  
19:16  
fine but I want to see what comes out of  
19:19  
it  
19:24  
Oh  
19:44  
what i would add so my first things god  
19:50  
only knows where i'll be 28 17 who's up  
19:52  
tonight oh but my thinking is yeah we  
19:58  
will evaluate this to say well you know

20:00  
we would have three have had three years  
20:04  
has it's been a useful exercise for the  
20:06  
cameras i'm going to go on the  
20:08  
assumption that the road and then yeah  
20:10  
then what i would anticipate is some  
20:12  
kind of another variation of something  
20:15  
like to say in 2015 2014 we as a campus  
20:20  
identified this is murdered as emerging  
20:23  
areas and these are our signatures where  
20:26  
we had in 2017 maybe it would be think  
20:29  
of some way to abridge the process since  
20:32  
we're not be started would not be  
20:33  
starting from scratch presumably in some  
20:34  
of the areas that we say our signature  
20:36  
that criteria indicate there they have a  
20:39  
sense of stability that they're not  
20:43  
going to hopefully not disappear by  
20:45  
talking but i would imagine what the  
20:46  
emergent or you might wanna we would  
20:48  
have some kind of process that would be  
20:49  
analogous  
21:00  
now leave me i'm looking closely at the  
21:03  
criterion i have a very important point  
21:07  
no question it's sort of educational  
21:13  
just what i'm sort of used to do there's  
21:16  
never no mention of the word national  
21:19

organ that talks about its place and  
21:23  
name names existing  
21:26  
I be clear like really emphasize name  
21:32  
and that would not  
21:36  
you're right now I think one of the  
21:38  
criteria heaven has to do the resources  
21:41  
and the quality the faculty or something  
21:46  
I think there might be what I get around  
21:50  
to is that you're fine and you're right  
21:53  
to interpret it that way I think again  
21:58  
we look in these emerging education area  
22:09  
we would say  
22:14  
advances instructional reputation and  
22:16  
recognition to achievements of the  
22:18  
faculty research teaching and service  
22:20  
salaries so it might take would be that  
22:23  
a faculty of national reputation  
22:25  
scenarios that would be a factor to  
22:28  
consider some so we hover advantage  
22:31  
impression it's not the week that the  
22:33  
area has to be the national significance  
22:35  
the area of the area could be low it  
22:39  
would strengthen ones application if  
22:41  
they could say there are resources and  
22:42  
putting faculty resources that bring a  
22:44  
recognized for patients  
22:51  
we imagine that there might

22:53  
some programs that signature programs in  
22:57  
terms of education  
23:05  
well so I don't think well well the  
23:12  
categories although again you can tell  
23:14  
is the flexing the process part of what  
23:16  
you'll see in each of these criteria are  
23:19  
in each of the areas is some version of  
23:23  
demonstrates to sustain synergy of  
23:24  
teaching and research in North service  
23:26  
in educational area and the research  
23:28  
areas dedicated and it demonstrates an  
23:30  
integration of the teaching so that is  
23:32  
clearly no matter what area we're  
23:35  
looking at one of our criteria given our  
23:38  
advisory group and I think merge from  
23:40  
the discussions are on campus is that  
23:43  
we're looking at things that are doing  
23:45  
both are doing all if you will but but  
23:49  
if the reality is you know most deserves  
23:52  
what you predominantly known for  
23:54  
significant in one area with evolution  
23:58  
there is my house  
24:05  
something that because  
24:15  
as I'm saying  
24:25  
so  
24:33  
go ahead  
24:42

yes  
24:49  
focusing  
24:53  
yeah totally I don't suppose I'm yes is  
24:57  
I think we'll make a stronger stronger  
24:59  
case on that criteria what weird what  
25:04  
again working with the advisor who what  
25:07  
we're trying to do is thinking more  
25:10  
broadly than the department level and so  
25:15  
the guy it's easier to teach by example  
25:20  
if I start giving examples to Rizzo  
25:22  
that's what he's thinking of humane  
25:23  
right so I ugly but areas that we would  
25:28  
say you know are things that that  
25:32  
without an example started that cover  
25:35  
that normal area with in June there  
25:37  
might be one part that's clearly the  
25:39  
ladies but other areas have expertise  
25:42  
and beer  
25:48  
paper  
25:54  
is it all  
25:59  
that's the idea  
26:04  
I  
26:06  
you had said that you may point out to  
26:09  
two different concept papers that my  
26:11  
goodness you've got a nice compliment  
26:13  
going on here will that also have  
26:16  
guidance of you know people in this

26:20  
particular discipline did not put  
26:22  
anything in that but you might want to  
26:24  
bring them in as well I mean this is  
26:26  
something which as it identifies paths  
26:30  
forward that it will sweep others into  
26:33  
it even if they were not initially  
26:35  
that's because I had I had not thought  
26:38  
it in that way but I can't see reason  
26:40  
why we wouldn't want to do that again  
26:42  
what I just phase it giving so you might  
26:45  
get a good deed back saying you know  
26:47  
what the way you described this it's  
26:49  
interesting but it's fairly narrow and  
26:51  
are you aware that there are people  
26:52  
these areas of campus that are doing  
26:54  
this encouraged i was attending more  
26:57  
than courage or asking the reason I ask  
26:59  
this in part is you know looking at the  
27:02  
lawn mark but also given the relatively  
27:05  
short window that's a fairly short  
27:08  
window to send out feelers to other  
27:11  
departments and really have faculty  
27:13  
discussed in any depth from across two  
27:16  
or three or four departments if it's the  
27:19  
first conversation  
27:28  
yep okay where we're trying to do is  
27:30

it's the idea to merge and say new ideas  
27:34  
that no one's thought of eating before  
27:36  
but we're gonna grab nuts another  
27:38  
position there so no I understand that  
27:41  
but I mean it's just to do this in a  
27:42  
manner where it's not some fat from one  
27:44  
department some another but the actual  
27:46  
departments themselves may say we really  
27:49  
don't want our eggs in that basket okay  
27:52  
to have that type of thorough  
27:54  
conversation would have taken more but  
27:56  
if you are then saying you know look at  
27:59  
the resources that we have how do we  
28:01  
harness them into these emerging  
28:03  
pathways that I can see that  
28:10  
the research side person faculty and  
28:13  
academic units tied in with the  
28:16  
organized research unit yep can you  
28:19  
speak to the incorporation between the  
28:23  
academic home unions and organized  
28:25  
research units is there any it is it  
28:28  
better if both pipes are together that  
28:32  
not necessary um so my thinking would be  
28:41  
again without say the tabular we haven't  
28:46  
decided these anything ahead of time but  
28:49  
our research centers are good examples  
28:50  
of interviewed a little bit displayed if



28:53  
a research center put in now one for  
28:55  
itself that would seem reasonable to me  
28:57  
because it is already interest or he  
28:58  
already does reach out into into units  
29:02  
i'm also i'm thinking about Michaels  
29:03  
wayward is questioning the way you're  
29:05  
going yours with you know in a way we're  
29:10  
trying to encourage more more ideas to  
29:15  
come forward and not because I'm going  
29:17  
to respond on you the phrase use do they  
29:19  
want to put their eggs in that basket  
29:20  
new spread your eggs anywhere you want  
29:22  
right you can have eggs and multiple  
29:24  
baskets because if it's relevant and I  
29:29  
feel sort of this so you know maybe in a  
29:31  
research we have some you know very good  
29:35  
interdisciplinary research so you know  
29:38  
some of them i would suggest are  
29:40  
probably at the suit well the other  
29:42  
thing we need to reach out artificially  
29:43  
to other areas if they already have  
29:44  
bacne interactive  
29:47  
use even if they're not you know being a  
29:49  
part of their line is an in the center  
29:51  
but they have a collaborative is  
29:52  
investigating unless or movies  
30:12

yeah i think so i think what we're going  
30:14  
to capture that as a natural leveraging  
30:17  
resources this idea you know that how  
30:21  
can reach within and outside the  
30:22  
university to leverage resources to make  
30:25  
more successful more likely to be  
30:26  
something i have a new concept paper  
30:35  
here ready and if we summon the earlier  
30:39  
Snow Fairy get over Sequoia I just want  
30:43  
to think I've already gotten one from  
30:44  
somebody else so we went through this  
30:50  
exercise to developing the concept  
30:54  
papers multiple units involved in green  
30:58  
Sciences aquaculture somehow we feel  
31:04  
like we have written a background and  
31:09  
the introduction section for a proposal  
31:13  
right so if you write a standard  
31:16  
proposal you have a background  
31:18  
introduction you have a hypothesis you  
31:22  
have an experimental design and  
31:24  
management plan and that's budget right  
31:27  
so this is the how you become so how do  
31:29  
you envision there's a 12 pages that you  
31:32  
proposal it's going to look like what  
31:36  
specifically you're asking for to  
31:39  
support pages prepare  
31:40  
that's a fair question I will start back

31:46  
I'm not looking for a budget on  
31:49  
experimental design but I think you hit  
31:53  
it well it is more of like the  
31:56  
introduction of rationale for for a  
31:59  
grandpa chosen because what this is not  
32:03  
this is different from grant proposal is  
32:05  
we're not giving out awards and I'm not  
32:08  
good if you roll over an act you don't  
32:09  
get next thousand dollars to do  
32:11  
something but you're all right what  
32:13  
you're arguing is that again in whatever  
32:17  
we're proposing marine sciences but that  
32:20  
be considered with the university may  
32:23  
again this Sigma cherry what that would  
32:26  
mean is as we move forward and we're  
32:28  
making decisions about budget we would  
32:30  
have agreed that science is an area that  
32:33  
we want to continue to support and maybe  
32:37  
to grow our support so what I envision  
32:42  
really is is really you get is more  
32:44  
level eyes with nancy's you would now  
32:47  
have do we say 12 ladies and functions  
32:49  
and tendons but they wait 12 pages to  
32:53  
really make that provide the data  
32:55  
there's only ask for things like if it's  
32:58  
an educational area about evidence that  
33:01

this program attracts top quality  
33:03  
students you know you can probably  
33:05  
address that someone but it was more  
33:07  
space you can get  
33:09  
technology can give you specifics and  
33:11  
you can flesh it out for you so really  
33:13  
we think they're just more okay to say  
33:15  
but a more detailed introduction  
33:17  
international section and then that's  
33:20  
where it's not lighting the grant  
33:22  
proposal we're not looking to find some  
33:24  
specific page looking to have guidance  
33:29  
as will be sure sort of the whole series  
33:32  
of micro decisions alone you're going to  
33:38  
a certain day with  
33:47  
urgent  
33:56  
but i can still  
34:00  
ground  
34:03  
yeah you know again I'll take you for  
34:06  
your content so you say the groundwork  
34:08  
has been laid and there's a lot of  
34:10  
interest in this in a phobic also you  
34:13  
might know we don't have the data but  
34:15  
nationally are their data or their data  
34:16  
to send me about the demographics or  
34:18  
whatever that would suggest that there  
34:22  
is potential to attract to target so

34:24  
yeah looking beyond  
34:28  
sources let's clarify one of the words  
34:31  
that use another signature program  
34:36  
conversion immersion program you would  
34:38  
continue the support and before you say  
34:43  
handle program so easy continue lumber I  
34:46  
thought we be clear I didn't say we will  
34:49  
quell his protégée I was relaying what  
34:51  
pathway one said on their proposal okay  
34:53  
and I would prefer not to use words but  
34:56  
i have no administrative speak which is  
34:59  
we have to make difficult decisions and  
35:01  
make priorities and shoot some areas of  
35:02  
rotten son within the work that way  
35:05  
before that is real we're not too thick  
35:09  
yeah we know you the president is going  
35:13  
to be sending out a message to the  
35:15  
campus soon and then he  
35:17  
walking tour of the given talks about  
35:20  
what situation can I prefer not to hear  
35:22  
details about it here we're facing  
35:24  
challenging budget times next year and  
35:26  
it to the next couple so where we are we  
35:29  
as a campus or a making difficult  
35:31  
decisions all the time about how to  
35:32  
allocate promise  
35:38

Carrey's are announced visitor areas in  
35:42  
person areas is this something where you  
35:44  
envision kind of website where  
35:46  
prospective students or Outsiders can  
35:48  
sort of  
35:49  
secrets of stretch our are they can be  
35:51  
linked to specific departments or  
35:53  
individual faculty might be listed  
35:56  
how do you see that was a bit of a sort  
35:59  
of generalized as a signature area but  
36:03  
yeah so far my answer to that is that  
36:08  
what we want to you want to get to the  
36:10  
point where we had this again I've said  
36:12  
this in other contexts of meetings with  
36:14  
the deans when they were asking me about  
36:15  
something similar the primary reason  
36:19  
we're doing this is what I've said we  
36:22  
will help us to guide making decisions  
36:25  
but there are secondary benefits there  
36:27  
that things like you're talking about  
36:29  
how can we use this to better at market  
36:31  
the university and help people  
36:34  
understand you know why our strengths  
36:35  
are so somewhat I would anticipate doing  
36:39  
is then going to the experts of  
36:41  
marketing and say yeah how is the best  
36:43  
way to do this again not being an expert

36:46  
in that but I my opinions I would  
36:48  
envision think something like website or  
36:50  
maybe even a brief public publication  
36:52  
that for one version of it might be  
36:55  
something we would use it in card with  
36:57  
our admissions officers another version  
36:59  
might be something we would give towards  
37:01  
the development officers that very  
37:03  
briefly summarize these are things that  
37:04  
university main is strong and we might  
37:06  
highlight a faculty member where we  
37:08  
might you know have a diagram that says  
37:10  
look we're strong in this area X and see  
37:13  
all the different areas that feed into x  
37:15  
I and show that it's multiple unit so  
37:19  
someone that depends on what comes out  
37:21  
but I guess might as long answer but my  
37:23  
answer is yes I do anticipate that this  
37:25  
will play a role in marketing the  
37:28  
University in the different ways that we  
37:30  
do it the exact way that looks could  
37:32  
depend upon market brat  
37:37  
I throw one more thing online  
37:43  
foundational at what point will they fit  
37:46  
so that's good for cursing and I get it  
37:48  
not as far along as I would like to be  
37:49

but i can tell you so they're thinking  
37:51  
about so again as I said at the outside  
37:54  
think I was really important component  
37:57  
miss and so I I what I'm looking to try  
38:03  
to invent and welcome he was thought to  
38:06  
how to do that there's a way of three  
38:08  
University to publicly really reaffirm  
38:11  
our commitment to you know what are  
38:15  
broad based liberal education and what  
38:17  
that involves I do i do not anticipate  
38:21  
process analogous to this because I see  
38:25  
it as different so for example she was a  
38:30  
we know where excellent in art is  
38:34  
chosen right so we don't we don't do I  
38:38  
need proposal from you to say we're  
38:40  
excellent in large and therefore we  
38:42  
should be supported because we're  
38:43  
excellent and let's say where we  
38:47  
hypothetically why in our history I want  
38:51  
to take it personally haven't done that  
38:53  
that was the first thing that popped  
38:55  
into I um I don't want to have a  
38:59  
proposal competition to say show me how  
39:01  
weak you are so that we can then invest  
39:04  
in is it different is a different thing  
39:06  
we need to be salad  
39:08  
area so what I'm trying to do is look in



39:10  
a way of having some kind of public  
39:12  
discourse about this and then identified  
39:14  
well how do we do that so where we're  
39:16  
starting at we're looking at things like  
39:18  
the leaked report from ACU the liberal  
39:22  
education and burgers promise about what  
39:25  
our ways of thinking about relational  
39:28  
education to 21st century and then  
39:30  
mapping that back on to the University  
39:32  
of Maine saying well if we're going to  
39:33  
do that what what were the heirs we need  
39:36  
to make sure we are so continuing to  
39:38  
support our supporting pattern so I know  
39:45  
where I want to get but I learned enough  
39:47  
in academic administration you can't go  
39:49  
there all not want to do that so I'm  
39:51  
trying to think of ways to really have  
39:54  
some kind of public discussion about how  
39:56  
do we reaffirm that and I wanted to be  
39:59  
more meaningful than just you know go  
40:01  
broad-based liberal education but how do  
40:04  
we identify these are the areas and just  
40:06  
analogously analogous to saying he  
40:10  
decided this is a signature area and  
40:12  
therefore we make tough decisions of our  
40:14  
resource allocation Reuters report this  
40:15

who will also said we decide we know  
40:18  
that these are foundational and we need  
40:21  
to we need to support those and I would  
40:25  
resist the idea that that ties very  
40:27  
simply to departments you could say  
40:30  
whatever you are Betemit every couch an  
40:31  
English department physics partner  
40:33  
chemistry math and that's true but I'll  
40:36  
take English example English  
40:39  
right right so they don't people learn  
40:41  
how to write and communicate we want to  
40:42  
make that you know say that's a  
40:44  
foundational area that that cuts across  
40:46  
the campus and how do you think how do  
40:48  
we envision supporting that as a  
40:51  
movement it's a little it's a little  
40:56  
different we are I'm working on it i  
40:58  
will have communication with unity way  
41:04  
back to the signature emerging area  
41:07  
things of the basic grammar signature  
41:11  
area are relatively clear but honor  
41:14  
could speak a bit more about merging  
41:16  
areas and what extent they already to be  
41:22  
established have a trafficker what  
41:24  
extent you're interested in innovative  
41:27  
proposals are suggested so i think where  
41:34  
we're at right now is where most

41:36  
interested in things that have someone  
41:39  
with track record and yet and then if we  
41:42  
can provide it is a little bit of  
41:44  
additional support organization can move  
41:46  
us up to a level as much as i would like  
41:50  
to be investing and things that are just  
41:52  
outside the box thinking the new those  
41:55  
aren't tend to be higher risk and you  
41:58  
made  
41:58  
in a situation we have a lot of funds to  
42:01  
put at risk so I wish respond a person  
42:07  
by saying I do this as being on a  
42:08  
continuum and it would be more toward  
42:11  
the there's an established groundwork on  
42:14  
this already part of the continued  
42:22  
can we try to reflect that in the  
42:25  
criteria you talked about  
42:40  
it's not a way we talk about potential  
42:44  
for sustainability and we talked about  
42:46  
in different area so what do we have  
42:47  
already that helps us to think that as  
42:50  
this emerges we're going to have the  
42:51  
resources to continues we're not we're  
42:54  
concerned about what we should be  
42:56  
concerned about of the campus investing  
42:58  
in something that's too focused on you  
43:00

know one individual or 11 area that that  
43:03  
we're at risk of not being able to  
43:05  
system  
43:19  
emerging minds let me look at them look  
43:21  
at that I do you want think merging  
43:24  
educational areas  
43:35  
I guess I was thinking more along the  
43:38  
lines and demonstrates growth potential  
43:40  
in raising rising prominence attracting  
43:44  
top gear and graduate dinner companion  
43:45  
grad students at the idea that we can  
43:46  
attract students here would be doing  
43:48  
well enough to keep thinking of the  
43:51  
researcher yep so you know some of these  
43:57  
questions in my mind with regards to say  
44:00  
you identify what a signature emerging  
44:02  
some cross-cutting research emphasis  
44:06  
that many faculty commitment departments  
44:09  
participate and university chooses that  
44:12  
they choose that you know better money  
44:14  
to the sentences you know part of a  
44:17  
research center so but that's  
44:19  
established research center gets money  
44:21  
so administrative leave you know you  
44:24  
know good length of your apartment pew  
44:26  
research center the money that goes into  
44:28  
this new area LZ and ministry yeah so so

44:36  
we're not going to create a new national  
44:39  
branch of singers routing poverty it's  
44:41  
going to be through those normal process  
44:43  
anyway funds are distributing the  
44:45  
university is you know it's a it's a  
44:50  
ugly process for people are you back  
44:53  
home that's one did so I don't just by  
44:55  
changing that right what I just know is  
44:57  
a Dean being able to say or not  
45:01  
you said we said this is a signature  
45:03  
area and it might advocate from my unit  
45:05  
to have support in this area I visitor  
45:09  
or die here with Carol claim is vice  
45:11  
president for research saying look we  
45:13  
agreed that this would be one of our  
45:15  
strong areas we need to put support  
45:18  
there let's go where we're not going to  
45:19  
get where we're going to get it from so  
45:22  
no revision our process is changing that  
45:25  
dramatic what was it was being the fact  
45:27  
what other area though thing that my  
45:31  
idea that had put this fits from both  
45:35  
the rocket scientist an engineer if  
45:38  
there's good me now that's right that's  
45:40  
good for you I finger for your head  
45:41  
because if two people say no we said  
45:43

that but one determine the engineering  
45:49  
money I guess putting it at what I'm  
45:52  
saying to you and said there's nothing  
45:54  
new we were doing that already all the  
45:56  
time we're already doing with mr.  
45:58  
research centers where lots of sciences  
46:05  
you know I would be trying to push cross  
46:07  
off Medina you might push myself to me  
46:09  
saying we both agree this is a great  
46:11  
idea in you should paper  
46:14  
that's kind of how so I don't it's been  
46:24  
any discussion of how this will affect  
46:26  
apart mental structures and by that I  
46:29  
mean suppose and please colleagues  
46:31  
forgive me those who feel them about to  
46:33  
tap into suppose we're going to put  
46:37  
forwards and emerging American Studies  
46:39  
program from English proper history will  
46:43  
drop from you have several other areas  
46:46  
how will that reshape those apartments  
46:50  
and how are those compartments to deal  
46:52  
with ok European 'used you're out those  
46:57  
positions won't be refilled in other  
46:59  
words the self-determination of  
47:00  
departments versus the sort of cross  
47:03  
departmental drivers it's been much  
47:08  
discussion on that no by my eye centers

47:10  
I don't know but I think that's what  
47:14  
makes a healthy institutions we ought to  
47:16  
be grappling with these kinds of  
47:18  
questions I think we'll be wrong for  
47:21  
someone like a position like mine was  
47:22  
saying either don't worry units every  
47:25  
will be ok is that's not true or here's  
47:27  
our process for dealing with that when I  
47:29  
can't anticipate what's coming is I mean  
47:31  
I i think that would likely about again  
47:33  
I'd see that it's a healthy thing for  
47:35  
institution to go and be periodically  
47:37  
saying are we organizing the best way  
47:39  
that we should that that happens because  
47:42  
tensions about  
47:44  
and units that were all happy or people  
47:46  
that all happen to be part of one of  
47:47  
them Sir collaborating elsewhere and  
47:49  
saying you know what or my time and  
47:51  
effort and interests are here and I'm  
47:53  
not going to be rewarding that way again  
47:56  
that's the sort of tension that rules  
47:58  
the organizations for excited I don't  
48:02  
think we should avoid that house think  
48:04  
it's premature to just say well here's  
48:05  
how we're going to solve yeah so this is  
48:09

real  
48:12  
criterion 50 plates do you see those  
48:15  
specifically about what you mean about  
48:18  
the existing junior resource base  
48:21  
section  
48:22  
oh so yeah so what we're thinking about  
48:26  
is part of this set that whole number 11  
48:30  
demonstrates a strong pick a place in  
48:34  
our discussions  
48:36  
we're coming up with these criteria the  
48:38  
question was asked about why me so you  
48:41  
might have do not have a or we minds are  
48:43  
very strongly provision in I think  
48:46  
alcohol in here goes I'm psychologist  
48:48  
saw to psychology I'm very proud of the  
48:51  
psych department here at university is  
48:52  
very strong by a variety of standards  
48:56  
but i would have a hug be hard-pressed  
48:58  
to argue that the psych department is a  
49:01  
unique strength for the university  
49:03  
degree maybe within the state of me but  
49:05  
within New England there are 30 strong  
49:08  
wind psychology so I have a hard time if  
49:12  
I just wanted to focus on the partner  
49:13  
psychologists say it's a signature area  
49:17  
of the University so what we're thinking  
49:21  
of that is why I mean what is how does



49:23  
it fit with the resources we have as a  
49:25  
state the natural resources or the go  
49:28  
back to the example the question is  
49:29  
local resources right what are the  
49:32  
things that are here that we are either  
49:34  
already accessing around the potential  
49:36  
to access to the support and advance  
49:40  
these kind of this kind of program it it  
49:46  
he was objected  
49:54  
it's all let me ask myself a question  
49:57  
rehearse the answer so I a technically  
50:02  
I've just been somebody said well what  
50:05  
if you're not the signature version does  
50:07  
that mean you're going to be cut and  
50:10  
again Rogers not my cell phone because  
50:12  
it's a tough question is the short  
50:15  
answers because no but not from India  
50:17  
University only has our signature  
50:19  
emerging areas that give me what they're  
50:22  
not distinctive areas if they're all we  
50:24  
have so we have to be looking and that's  
50:27  
where part of the conversational  
50:28  
foundation areas comes in and then there  
50:32  
are a variety of factors way into how  
50:35  
you make decisions this goes back from  
50:36  
Pearson maybe they're areas that while  
50:39

you all choose my pic on my own for  
50:42  
department one so I just said all those  
50:44  
things about the part of psychology and  
50:45  
probably my opinion wouldn't meet the  
50:47  
criteria for signature but does that  
50:50  
mean we're going to cut it we're not  
50:52  
actually economically we just we have  
50:54  
500 papers in psychology is a relatively  
50:57  
inexpensive mayor to deliver and another  
51:00  
national scene we have you know a  
51:03  
doctoral program right for moment  
51:06  
recently was identified as well the top  
51:08  
the best best training experiences these  
51:11  
are these are good things they don't  
51:12  
make us all don't meet these criteria  
51:14  
they're still strengths at the  
51:15  
University I don't want people walk away  
51:17  
the idea that guys like if I don't apply  
51:19  
for this I just wrote my own whether my  
51:22  
departments death warrant we're going to  
51:25  
continue to have a lot of things in turn  
51:26  
seems you're in emerging that's part of  
51:29  
what makes up the university the harder  
51:31  
part of the answer is is you're getting  
51:34  
at it i'm not using very cannibalize but  
51:37  
the reality is we have to make difficult  
51:38  
decisions about avoiding being we're not

51:40  
gonna continue to be that's what ever  
51:42  
they have been going on here for a long  
51:45  
time it's continuing to go I you know my  
51:50  
goal opportunity here will recover long  
51:53  
in this position is for us to be able to  
51:55  
do that in a more thoughtful open way  
51:57  
say well this is this is a way / moving  
51:59  
and not so much we're going to stop  
52:02  
doing Chris too because how we had a  
52:04  
munchkin believe  
52:05  
how we are thinking more strategically  
52:09  
abroad about how  
52:20  
Jeff I just wanted to put this on the  
52:22  
table you know that I've been arguing  
52:24  
this for years hear that university of  
52:26  
maine is one of about 350 universities  
52:30  
that's trapped by the center for  
52:32  
measuring university performance one of  
52:34  
the top 100 in some ways american public  
52:38  
research university there are very  
52:40  
specific criteria that are used to judge  
52:43  
researcher routes and signature pneus  
52:46  
and those are those is that or is the  
52:50  
committee prepared to accept those as  
52:53  
the key indicators form for research  
52:56  
gasps and so yes my dreams yeah sounds  
52:59

like me expandable you know no good no  
53:02  
one asked this question which those are  
53:04  
pretty cryptic criteria and that is also  
53:07  
a purpose because we are a diverse the  
53:10  
university we do a variety of things and  
53:12  
we certainly you now you have to define  
53:16  
how you are distinctive and innovative  
53:19  
and here's our definition in that a  
53:20  
definition will fit some areas it won't  
53:22  
fit other so yes if you put in for a  
53:25  
researcher research area and you can  
53:28  
cite those kind of national standards  
53:30  
those are exactly the kind of things we  
53:31  
would expect people to do to make it  
53:33  
the garden we don't want to say ahead of  
53:36  
time everyone has to do that with more  
53:37  
applicable to some areas and it is  
53:39  
telling so to summarize them if there's  
53:44  
a center of excellence here you're not  
53:45  
playing because  
53:50  
resource  
53:52  
right  
53:59  
we had like earlier your you missed the  
54:04  
advisory TV but you're under review team  
54:06  
that immediately comments are from that  
54:07  
perspective or why do you think about a  
54:10  
Jeff is well you were in advisory where

54:11  
they really think I've missed capture  
54:13  
the essence of the discussion  
54:24  
this  
54:30  
le was on the advisory group wasn't that  
54:33  
the junior but did send nice written  
54:34  
input would be appreciated probably  
54:37  
france why you were there well the  
54:39  
American history from the capturing how  
54:42  
them know that I guess I'm distressed  
54:45  
that this is you know seems like this  
54:47  
process for me  
54:51  
there's the things that are  
54:53  
written stuff  
54:56  
me that school be far  
55:23  
because sometimes ideas  
55:27  
and emerged in classes  
55:32  
why  
55:36  
stay with  
55:48  
see anyone else who's missing I will you  
55:52  
may note the absence of Dean's at this  
55:54  
meeting Saturday abandoned me and it's  
55:58  
not that they they were you saw they  
56:01  
were all participants in the advisory  
56:02  
group they were also with the  
56:03  
disciplines of reviewers it was the  
56:06  
second  
56:23

what the hit rate will be after proposed  
56:26  
or we had as a ten percent i don't know  
56:30  
because i really don't know i think it  
56:32  
formally their informal that they said  
56:38  
you're going to operable  
56:47  
we'll publish  
56:52  
who else  
56:57  
okay again that I you know this is  
56:59  
Francois census of flexible process you  
57:02  
know if you do have further thoughts  
57:03  
shoot me an email you know I'll turn the  
57:06  
best to address them and i'll post  
57:08  
whatever i do a website and just by the  
57:12  
worry was your colleagues who know i  
57:14  
think you've heard here they think might  
57:15  
be helpful for them addressing the  
57:17  
question then thanks a lot for coming in  
57:21  
to preview the flexibility